

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the final official action of May 8, 2007, wherein claims 1, 6-10, and 13-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

This paper is timely filed.

In response, claims 1, 13, 23, and 32 are amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection only and not to define over the prior art. Claims 6, 8, 14, 15, 17, 18, 24, 25, 33, 34, 36, and 37 are amended in view of the amendments to claims 1, 13, 23, and 32. Claims 22 and 31 are canceled. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 13, 23, and 32 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, support may be found in paragraph [0016]. No new matter is added. As a result, claims 1, 6-10, 13-21, 23-30, and 32-38 remain pending and at issue.

Telephone Interview Summary

The applicants thank the examiner for his participation in a brief telephone discussion on July 10, 2007, regarding the § 112 rejections. While no agreement was reached with respect to particular claim language that would be acceptable, the examiner indicated that more closely tracking the language in paragraph [0016] might be acceptable.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The applicants respectfully submit that the § 112 rejections are moot in view of the amendments to claims 1, 13, 23, and 32. In particular, the term “misuse” is substituted for the term “anomaly,” and the method step of converting data appertaining to the misuse into control commands appertaining to the misuse is added. Written description support for these amendments may be found in paragraph [0016] as originally filed, which states:

[0016] The measures depicted can further increase the reliability of the parcel compartment systems and the method. This is especially the case because, if instances of misuse occur at one of the parcel compartment systems, the appertaining data is transmitted to the server and subsequently converted into control commands for all of the parcel compartment systems.

Thus, the claim amendments herein are fully and adequately supported by the original specification and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections.

Conclusion

The applicants respectfully request entry of the foregoing amendments, consideration of the foregoing remarks, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6-10, and 13-38. The applicants respectfully submit that the amendments submitted herewith do not raise any new issues as the amendments were not made to distinguish over the prior art, and could not have been submitted earlier as the rejections responded to were first raised in the most recent action.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

August 1, 2007

By: /Michael A. Chinlund/
Michael A. Chinlund, Reg. No. 55,064
Agent for Applicants
Customer No. 04743

6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300